

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 13-15 and 19-21 were pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-9 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 13 and 19 have been amended to recite the features previously recited by now-cancelled claims 8 and 9, respectively. No new matter has been presented. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 13-15 and 19-21 will be pending herein and, for the reasons set forth below, are all believed to be in condition for allowance.

In the final Office Action dated August 27, 2010,

- Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs (US 5,968,073) in view of Burgert et al. (US 4,984,579, "Burgert") and further in view of Matsui (US 6,551,237);
- Claims 13-15 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs, Burgert and Matsui and further in view of Englehardt et al. (US 4,831,242, "Englehardt"); and
- Claims 13-15 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs, Burgert and Matsui and further in view of Imai (US 7,603,282).

These grounds of rejection are respectfully traversed.

Examiner Abyaneh is thanked for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during the telephonic interview conducted October 18, 2010. The substance of that interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

As explained during the interview, the focus of the amended claims of the present application is on an "authentication means" that is employed in connection with a compression pressure control unit that controls the pressure of a band worn on a limb of a user to restrict blood flow to that limb.

The "authentication means" feature of the claimed invention is recited by each of claims 13 and 19 (which have now been amended with the features of their respective independent claims, now cancelled).

As explained during the interview with respect to previously pending claims 9 and 19, an embodiment of the present invention requires

- a first recording means - for recording a critical compression pressure,
- a first input means - for supplying the critical compression pressure to the first recording means,
- a second recording means - for recording a maximum value of compression pressure, and
- a second input means - for supplying the maximum value of compression pressure, the maximum value of compression pressure recorded on the second recording means being controlled not to exceed the preset critical compression pressure.

Notably, as further required by claim 19, the first input means is adapted to freely be attached to and removed from a main body of the compression pressure control unit.

Claim 19 still also requires

an authentication means for determining whether or not an input from said first input means is allowed, wherein the input from said first input means is accepted only when said authentication means performs authentication indicating that the input is permitted.

Thus, there are two separate ("first" and "second") input/recording means pairs, and the first input means is adapted to be freely attached to and removed from the main body of the device, and is subject to authentication.

The first input means can be employed by, e.g., a trainer or authorized person to load into the compression pressure control unit a critical compression pressure, whereas the second input means may be employed by a user of the compression pressure control unit to load a maximum compression pressure, but where the maximum compression pressure cannot exceed the critical compression pressure. In other words, the "critical" value bounds the "maximum" value. A trainer can input the critical value, and a user, while being able to control compression pressure

can never set the compression pressure control unit to deliver an amount of pressure beyond the critical compression pressure. Again, the critical value (input via the first input means) bounds the maximum pressure (input via the second input means).

The authentication means is shown in, e.g., Fig. 21 as "authentication part N" and a feature of the authentication means is shown in Figure 22, wherein, in, e.g., a stand-by mode, the system can enter a "trainer mode" only when valid data is authenticated. See, e.g., steps S2053, S2055, S2056 in Fig. 22. If not authenticated, the system proceeds to a "user mode." In the user mode, a user can still operate the system up to the maximum compression pressure, but not beyond the critical pressure.

Englehardt and Imai were each cited as allegedly disclosing the authentication feature of claim 19, and Englehardt, in particular, was discussed during the telephone interview.

Englehardt is concerned with controlling entry into a fitness club or enabling the operation of exercise machines therein. A main (or central) computer system determines whether a given user is authorized, and if not so authorized the user will be given access to the facility or the equipment will not be permitted to operate. See, e.g., col. 2, lines 2-10 of Englehardt.

Thus, Englehardt discloses only the use of authorization in connection with enabling equipment to operate at all (or providing access to a facility), whereas in the claimed invention, authentication is used in a much more precise and particular fashion. Namely, authentication is used only in connection with the first input means, and where authentication fails, the compression pressure control unit will be placed in a mode ("user mode") that will still allow a user to operate the equipment, albeit at a preset critical compression pressure already recorded. This specific use of authentication in the present invention permits only qualified/authorized trainers and the like to provide appropriate settings to the system.

Again, it is emphasized that the authentication in accordance with the claimed invention is limited to input from said first input means such that it is only the critical values that are subjected to authentication. Englehardt does not disclose such a configuration or approach.

Likewise, Imai discloses a very general use of authentication in which a doctor is asked to supply a password to gain access to medical records and the like. See col. 12, lines 18-34 of Imai. Thus, Imai also does not disclose or suggest the claimed configuration in which only one type of input information is subjected to authentication.

Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that the applied §103(a) rejections cannot be sustained. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these grounds of rejection are accordingly respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Dated: October 27, 2010

Respectfully submitted by:

EDELL, SHAPIRO & FINNAN, LLC
CUSTOMER No. 92270
1901 Research Boulevard, Suite 400
Rockville, MD 20850
(301) 424-3640

/Lawrence D. Eisen/
Lawrence D. Eisen
Reg. No. 41009